

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-30 are pending in this case, Claims 1-29 having been amended to clarify features previously presented and to address cosmetic matters of form. Claim 30 is added and may find support in the specification at least in paragraph [0057]. No new matter is added.¹

In the Official Action, Claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 9, 12, 13, 18, 19, 26, and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as anticipated by Miklos et al. (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0181435, hereinafter “Miklos”); Claims 2, 3, 10, 11, 14-17, and 23-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Miklos in view of Lewis (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2006/0079289); and Claims 6, 7, 20, 21, 28, and 29 were indicated as allowable if rewritten to in independent for including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant appreciatively acknowledges the identification of allowable subject matter in Claims 6, 7, 20, 21, 28, and 29. In an effort to expedite prosecution of this application, independent Claim 1 has been rewritten to incorporate the allowable subject matter of Claim 6, however, without including the limitation “said second station is further configured to transmit the second section in a time divisional manner after transmitting the first section.”

Likewise, independent Claim 12 has been rewritten to incorporate the allowable subject matter of Claim 20, however, without including the limitation “said second station is further configured to transmit the second section in a time divisional manner after transmitting the first section.” Similarly, independent Claim 22 has been rewritten to incorporate the allowable subject matter of Claim 28, however, without including the

¹ Claims 1-29 are amended to clarify features previously presented and to preclude possible interpretation of a lack of clear antecedent basis.

limitation “said communication means time-divisionally transmits the second section after transmitting the first section.”

Applicant respectfully submits that the applied references do not disclose or suggest “the request to send signal received by said second communication station includes an addresses of said second communication station,” **and** “the clear to send signal includes a first section including information used to indicate an interval of time during which a communication station having an address that is not included in the request to send signal must stop its communication operation, and a second section including the address of said second communication station,” as recited in amended Claim 1. Therefore, independent Claim 1 (and the claims dependent therefrom) is believed to be allowable.

For substantially the same reasons as discussed with regard to Claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 12 and 22 also patentably define over the applied references. Therefore, independent Claims 12 and 22 (and the claims dependent therefrom) are believed to be allowable.

Claim 9, while differing in scope and statutory class from Claim 1, patentably defines over the applied references for substantially the same reasons as Claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the applied references do not anticipate or make obvious the features of Claim 9. Therefore, independent Claim 9 (and the claims dependent therefrom) is believed to patentably define over the applied reference.

New Claim 30 is added to provide more detailed aspects of Applicants specification not suggested or disclosed by the art of record. Claim 30 is submitted to patentably define over the applied references by virtue of at least its dependency on Claim 1.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above discussions, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome. The application as amended herewith is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)

Edward W. Tracy
Registration No. 47,998